Corinna-Bridgett [Family: Oleson], *suae potestas esse*[1],
One of the sovereign American People living in Oregon,
In care of: 18675 Southwest Kinnaman Road,
Aloha (07), Oregon, United States of America
ZIP Exempt (per USPS D.M.M., Section 122.32)

In the District Court of the United States,
for the Federal District of Oregon,

sitting at Portland, Oregon.

"WASHINGTON MUTUAL BANK, N. A.", a foreign banking corporation, Borrower, and *ens legis* "person",
(putative[2]) Plaintiff.
Vs.

"CORINNA OLESON"; and All OCCUPANTS of Address: 18675 SW Kinnaman Rd, Aloha, OR 97007", *ens legis* persons,
(putative) Defendants,
And

Corinna-Bridgett, *in esse*, Principal, Lender-in-Fact, and superior Creditor,
Third Party Intervener of Right.

Case No. **CV08-0813PK**

In Admiralty

Defendants' Motion to Vacate Void "ORDER TO REMAND" filed into the Court Record on September 2, A. D. 2008

Mandatory Judicial Notice of 18 U.S.C. Sections 3, 4, 241, 1001, 1341, 1343, 1346, 1513, 1956, 1961, 1962, 1963, and 1964 et seq. (R.I.C.O.)

Immediate Action Required by Court Clerk

Demand for Common Law Trial by Jury
(Seventh Amendment)

The above named *ens legis* Defendants' (*i.e.*, artificial "persons"), by and through the live Third Party Intervener of Right **Corinna-Bridgett**, hereby move this honorable court to vacate "Judge" Ancer L. Haggerty's void "ORDER TO REMAND" under authority of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, RULE 60(b)(4), for reason that the court lacked subject matter jurisdiction to remand this Removal Complaint; and also give lawful direction to "Judge" Ancer L. Haggerty of proper handling of a motion brought under authority of F.R.Civ.P. RULE 60(b)(4).

---

[1] ***suae potestas esse*** – having full Power and Authority over one's own dominions

[2] **putative** (adjective) - commonly put forth or accepted as true on inconclusive grounds

Brief in Support of Motion to Vacate Void "ORDER TO REMAND"

First Point: "Judge" Ancer L. Haggerty is presumed to be highly intelligent, well trained and knowledgeable in the law and therefore knows and understands that a motion to remand which tenders for consideration matters not of record. All of the putative Plaintiff's alleged attorneys' so-called motion to remand adheres to the summary judgment standard requiring affidavits, depositions, admissions, answers to interrogatories, and other testimony and authenticated evidence such as would be admissible at trial. Moreover, no judge or magistrate in America has any lawful judicial power (subject matter jurisdiction) to evaluate Material Facts, which are of course reserved for trial by jury, unless trial by jury is expressly waived.

Second Point: As "Judge" Ancer L. Haggerty is required to be competent in the law, as found in The Code of Conduct for United States Judges, "Judge" Haggerty absolutely knows and understands that the "ORDER TO REMAND" was done in clear absence of jurisdiction for reason of **flagrant denial of due process**, to wit: "Judge" Haggerty as a convenience to the putative Plaintiff: (1) disregarded the un-rebutted sworn testimony of the live Third Party Intervener of Right **Corinna-Bridgett**; (2) Relied on statements of counsel without support of so much as one competent material fact witness and without one whit of evidence properly authenticated as required in the Federal Rules of Evidence; and (3) Notwithstanding the fact that no one on behalf of the putative Plaintiff, with first-hand personal knowledge, responded or entered any verified Material Facts on the Record and "Judge" Haggerty, in aid and comfort to the putative Plaintiff alleged attorney, determined **facts not properly before the court and which are strictly reserved to be determined by a jury**.

Notice to "Judge" Haggerty in Regard to his Unseemly Bias and Partiality in favor of putative Plaintiff and its alleged Attorneys

Please explain why, if it is well settled by the federal courts that to show standing in a foreclosure action, the plaintiff must show that it is the holder of the note and the mortgage at the time the complaint was filed; and, the foreclosure plaintiff must also show, at the time the foreclosure action is filed, that the holder of the note and mortgage is harmed, usually by not having received payments on the note (see two recent cases fully affirming this: i.e., *In re Foreclosure Cases,* No. 1:07CV2282, et al., slip op. (N.D. Ohio Oct. 31, 2007) (Boyko, J.) and *In re Foreclosure Cases,* No. 3:07CV00286, et al., slip op. (S.D. Ohio Nov. 15, 2007) (Rose, T.)), that this foundational principle was willfully and intentionally ignored by you in signing the void "ORDER TO REMAND".

Please also explain why, if it is well settled by the federal courts that to satisfy Article III's standing requirements, a complaining Party must show: (1) they have suffered an injury in fact that is concrete and particularized and actual or imminent, not conjectural or hypothetical; (2) the injury is fairly traceable to

the challenged action of the Adverse Party; and (3) it is likely, as opposed to merely speculative, that the injury will be redressed by a favorable decision (*Loren,* 2007 WL 2726704 at *7) and the face of the Record testifies that the live Third Party Intervener of Right **Corinna-Bridgett** has fully complied with all three of the aforesaid requirements, that your action in signing the void "ORDER TO REMAND" is not an abuse of power under color of law and color of office in full accord with the core statements in the following commentaries:

"Nothing can destroy a government more quickly than its failure to observe its own laws, or worse, its disregard of the charter of its own existence." - Former Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court – Mr. Justice Tom Clark.

"Our government is the potent, the omnipresent teacher. For good or for ill, it teaches the whole people by its example. If the Government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy." - Former Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court – Mr. Justice Louis Brandeis.

"If you will lie, you will cheat. If you will cheat, you will steal. If you will steal, you will kill." - Current Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court – Mr. Justice Clarence Thomas.

"Rigging contests renders rigged contest winners stupid." - Former Associate Director of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development under George Herbert Walker Bush and William Jefferson Clinton – Kathryn Austin Fitts.

"As an attorney, it was my mandate to fight against authority when it was overbearing, abusive, or unjust, but also to respect and believe in the system. When I challenged the system it was not from disrespect; rather, it was the ultimate form of respect. I understood then, as I do today, **that absent challenge, authority becomes totalitarian**. Authority needs to be challenged if we are to ensure the integrity of the process. It is one of the great truths of our system." – Judge Harold J. Rothwax.

Harold J. Rothwax is a 25-year veteran of the New York State Supreme Court. He has also been a senior trial attorney for the Criminal Defense Division of the Legal Aid Society, a vice chairperson of the New York Civil Liberties Union, a lecturer at Columbia Law School, and was a Guggenheim Fellow at the Yale Law School in 1984. He is the recipient of the New York State Bar Association Award for Outstanding Achievements in the Field of Criminal Law Education.

Catherine Crier says of **our legal system** that it is, **"profoundly unfair"**. That "**it produces results and profits for the few and paralysis, frustration, and injustice for the many"**.

Lawyers, politicians, and bureaucrats have taken the palace without firing a shot. These groups control the creation and enforcement of law. **Their ability to write rules and manipulate them at will**

has established a new Tyranny in America. Our great cornerstone of democracy, the rule of law, has become a source of power and influence, not liberty and justice.

In A. D. 1989 Stephen P. Magee concluded that the optimum number of lawyers in our society was 60 percent fewer than those then practicing. He presented his findings to the White House and again in his book: ***Black Hole, Tariffs and Endogenous Policy Theory***. This economist estimated that every additional lawyer over the number reduced our gross domestic product by about $2.5 million.

In A. D. 1999, of the twenty-four big federal agencies, only thirteen could provide reliable enough financial records to undergo an annual audit. The Pentagon hasn't submitted a report capable of being audited since at least 1992. In his GAO investigation, Senator Fred Thompson noted that the monies this agency couldn't account for in 1999, $2.3 trillion, exceeded the entire federal budget that year. Multiply this by fifty-four agencies and just imagine what financial atrocities have been concealed in the past.

According to William Greider in his heartbreaking work, Who Will Tell the People: "***The practical result is a lawless government – a reality no one in power wishes to face squarely since all are implicated***." The classical sense of law is lost in sliding scales of targets and goals, acceptable tolerance and negotiated exceptions, discretionary enforcement and discretionary compliance.

Leading up to the presidential primaries in 2000, a *Business Week* article looked at where support was shaping up. Of the 389 top CEOs who had contributed thus far, seventy-seven of them donated to multiple candidates. Fifty-two picked contenders in both parties. Ellen S. Miller, executive director of Clean Campaign, offers this explanation. "This illustrates the investment theory of politics. These donors think no matter who wins, we'll have our hand in his pocket.'"

The American "justice" system very definitely is in need of a serious house-cleaning.

After serving as a judge in Texas, Catherine Crier hosted *Catherine Crier Live,* on Court TV. She began her television career as news anchor and talk show host at CNN, went on to win her first Emmy in 1996 for her work as a correspondent on ABC's 20/20, then hosted an issues show for the FOX News Channel.

Known simply as "Judge" on Fox News Channel, Andrew Napolitano is set to release his blockbuster book on the misuse and abuse of power in the U.S. criminal justice system, "Constitutional Chaos: **What Happens When the Government Breaks its Own Laws." "Constitutional Chaos"** makes the case that there is a pernicious and ever-expanding pattern of government abuse in America's criminal justice system.

///

Napolitano's vast experience in the legal world has prompted him to adopt as the creed: "**The government is not your friend.**" He reiterates that creed in the introduction of "Constitutional Chaos": It should be against the law to break the law. Unfortunately, it is not. In early 21st century America, a long-standing dirty little secret still exists among public officials, politicians, judges, prosecutors and police. **The live agents government - federal, state and local – have decided they are not bound to obey the laws applicable to them and their actions**. I know this sounds crazy, but the events recounted in this book prove it true. "Constitutional Chaos" should be a wake-up call for every American who prizes Personal Liberty in a free Society. **Because it breaks the law, the government is not your friend.** When I arrived on the bench, I had impeccable conservative Republican law-and-order credentials.

When I left eight years later, I was a born-again individualist, after witnessing first-hand how the criminal justice system works to subvert and shred the Constitution. You think you've got rights that are guaranteed? Well, think again. **Because the government breaks the law and denies it, the government is not your friend**. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, particularly when it comes to the American "justice" system. Nowhere else does the state have greater raw power over an Individual's Life, Liberty, and Property. And nowhere else are our constitutionally guaranteed Rights and Freedoms under such a relentless, subtle and ultimately devastating attack. Because the government breaks the law and hides it, the government is not your friend. An attorney, law professor, commentator and judge, Napolitano is Fox's chief legal analyst and substitute host of "The Big Story."

In his latest book, **Napolitano gives specific examples of government agents figuratively thumbing their noses at the Constitution**. Continues Napolitano in the book's introduction: Even though the Constitution, through the First Amendment and 14th Amendment, commands that neither the federal government nor the state governments can abridge the freedom of speech, you will see shortly that the government regularly prosecutes Americans for speaking freely and punishes them when they say things that the government doesn't want to hear. **Despite the government's duty to use its power to protect us, you will see how the federal and state governments have failed to protect us and have enacted laws, which make it impossible for us to protect ourselves.** ***Despite the government's obligation to protect us from crime, you will learn that the government actually creates crime by setting traps for the ignorant, the naïve, the criminally inclined and (those it hates).***

///

Judge Edith Jones of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, told the Federalist Society of Harvard Law School that "**The American legal system has been corrupted almost beyond recognition**". She said that the question of what is morally right is routinely sacrificed to what is politically expedient. The change has come because legal philosophy has descended to nihilism. "The

integrity of law, its religious roots, its transcendent quality are disappearing. I saw the movie 'Chicago' with Richard Gere the other day. That's the way the public thinks about lawyers," she told the students. "The first 100 years of American lawyers were trained on Blackstone, who wrote that: **'The law of nature dictated by God himself is binding in all counties and at all times; no human laws are of any validity if contrary to this; and such of them as are valid derive all force and all their authority from this original.'** The Framers created a government of limited power with this understanding of the rule of law - that it was dependent on transcendent religious obligation," said Jones.

She said that the business about all of the Founding Fathers being deists is "just wrong," or "way overblown." She says they believed in "faith and reason," and this did not lead to intolerance. "This is not a prescription for intolerance or narrow sectarianism," she continued, "for unalienable rights were given by God to all our fellow citizens. Having lost sight of the moral and religious foundations of the rule of law, we are vulnerable to the destruction of our freedom, our equality before the law and our self-respect. It is my fervent hope that this new century will experience a revival of the original understanding of the rule of law and its roots. "The answer is a recovery of moral principle, the sine qua non of an orderly society. Post 9-11, many events have been clarified. It is hard to remain a moral relativist when your own people are being killed." According to the judge, the first contemporary threat to the rule of law comes from within the legal system itself. Alexis de Tocqueville, author of Democracy in America and one of the first writers to observe the United States from the outside looking-in, "described lawyers as a natural aristocracy in America," Jones told the students. "The intellectual basis of their profession and the study of law based on venerable precedents bred in them habits of order and a taste for formalities and predictability." As Tocqueville saw it, "These qualities enabled attorneys to stand apart from the passions of the majority. Lawyers were respected by the citizens and able to guide them and moderate the public's whims. Lawyers were essential to tempering the potential tyranny of the majority. "Some lawyers may still perceive our profession in this flattering light, but to judge from polls and the tenor of lawyer jokes, I doubt the public shares Tocqueville's view anymore, and it is hard for us to do so. "The legal aristocracy have shed their professional independence for the temptations and materialism associated with becoming businessmen. Because law has become a self-avowed business, pressure mounts to give clients the advice they want to hear, to pander to the clients' goal through deft manipulation of the law. While the business mentality produces certain benefits, like occasional competition to charge clients lower fees, other adverse effects include advertising and shameless self-promotion. **The legal system has also been wounded by lawyers who themselves no longer respect the rule of law**." The judge quoted Kenneth Starr as saying, "It is decidedly unchristian to win at any cost," and added that most lawyers agree with him. However, "An increasingly visible and vocal number apparently believe that the strategic use of anger and incivility will achieve their aims. **Others seem uninhibited about making misstatements to**

the court or their opponents or destroying or falsifying evidence," she claimed. "When lawyers cannot be trusted to observe the fair processes essential to maintaining the rule of law, how can we expect the public to respect the process?"

Lawsuits Do Not Bring "Social Justice"

Another pernicious development within the legal system is the misuse of lawsuits, according to her. "We see lawsuits wielded as weapons of revenge," she says. "**Lawsuits are brought that ultimately line the pockets of lawyers rather than their clients**. The lawsuit is not the best way to achieve social justice, and to think it is, is a seriously flawed hypothesis. There are better ways to achieve social goals than by going into court." Jones said that employment litigation is a particularly fertile field for this kind of abuse. "Seldom are employment discrimination suits in our court supported by direct evidence of race or sex-based animosity. Instead, the courts are asked to revisit petty interoffice disputes and to infer invidious motives from trivial comments or work-performance criticism. Recrimination, second-guessing and suspicion plague the workplace when tenuous discrimination suits are filed creating an atmosphere in which many corporate defendants are forced into costly settlements because they simply cannot afford to vindicate their positions. "While the historical purpose of the common law was to compensate for individual injuries, this new litigation instead purports to achieve redistributive social justice. Scratch the surface of the attorneys' self-serving press releases, however, and one finds how enormously profitable social redistribution is for those lawyers who call themselves 'agents of change.'" Jones wonders, "What social goal is achieved by transferring millions of dollars to the lawyers, while their clients obtain coupons or token rebates." The judge quoted morality has definite public consequences," she said. "Their misbehavior feeds on itself, encouraging disrespect and debasement of the rule of law as the public become encouraged to press their own advantage in a system they perceive as manipulatable." The second threat to the rule of law comes from government, which is encumbered with agencies that have made the law so complicated that it is difficult to decipher and often contradicts itself. "Agencies have an inherent tendency to expand their mandate," says Jones. "At the same time, their decision-making often becomes parochial and short-sighted. They may be captured by the entities that are ostensibly being regulated, or they may pursue agency self-interest at the expense of the public welfare. Citizens left at the mercy of selective and unpredictable agency action have little recourse." Jones recommends three books by Philip Howard: The Death of Common Sense, The Collapse of the Common Good and The Lost Art of Drawing the Line, which further delineate this problem. The third and most comprehensive threat to the rule of law arises from contemporary legal philosophy. "Throughout my professional life, American legal education has been ruled by theories like positivism, the residue of legal realism, critical legal studies, post-modernism and other philosophical fashions," said Jones. "Each of these theories has a lot to say about the 'is' of law, but none of them addresses the 'ought,' the moral foundation or direction of law." Jones

quoted Roger C. Cramton, a law professor at Cornell University, who wrote in the 1970's that "the ordinary religion of the law school classroom" is "a moral relativism tending toward nihilism, a pragmatism tending toward an amoral instrumentalism, a realism tending toward cynicism, an individualism tending toward atomism, and a faith in reason and democratic processes tending toward mere credulity and idolatry." No 'Great Awakening' In Law School Classrooms. The judge said ruefully, "There has been no Great Awakening in the law school classroom since those words were written." She maintained that now it is even worse because faith and democratic processes are breaking down. "The problem with legal philosophy today is that it reflects all too well the broader post-Enlightenment problem of philosophy," Jones said. She quoted Ernest Fortin, who wrote in Crisis magazine: "The whole of modern thought has been a series of heroic attempts to reconstruct a world of human meaning and value on the basis of our purely mechanistic understanding of the universe." Jones said that all of these threats to the rule of law have a common thread running through them, and she quoted Professor Harold Berman to identify it: "The traditional Western beliefs in the structural integrity of law, its on-going-ness, its religious roots, its transcendent qualities, are disappearing not only from the minds of law teachers and law students but also from the consciousness of the vast majority of citizens, the people as a whole; and more than that, they are disappearing from the law itself.

The law itself is becoming more fragmented, more subjective, geared more to expediency and less to morality. The historical soil of the Western legal tradition is being washed away and the tradition itself is threatened with collapse." Judge Jones concluded with another thought from George Washington: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness - these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens."

Upon taking questions from students, Judge Jones recommended Michael Novak's book: ***On Two Wings: Humble Faith and Common Sense***. "Natural law is not a prescriptive way to solve problems," Jones said. "It is a way to look at life starting with the Ten Commandments." Natural law provides "a framework for government that permits human freedom," Jones said. "If you take that away, what are you left with? Bodily senses? The will of the Majority? The communist view? What is it - 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his need?' I don't even remember it, thank the Lord," she said to the amusement of the students. "I am an unabashed patriot - I think the United States is the healthiest society in the world at this point in time," Jones said, although she did concede that there were other ways to accommodate the rule of law, such as constitutional monarchy. "Our legal system is way out of kilter," she said. "The tort litigating system is wreaking havoc. Look at any trials that have been conducted on TV. These lawyers are willing to say anything." Potential Nominee to Supreme Court Judge Edith Jones

has been mentioned as a potential nominee to the Supreme Court in the Bush administration, but does not relish the idea. "Have you looked at what people have to go through who are nominated for federal appointments? They have to answer questions like, 'Did you pay your nanny taxes?' 'Is your yard man illegal?' "In those circumstances, who is going to go out to be a federal judge? People who have accomplished nothing. In other words, federal employees." Source - Geraldine Hawkins, March 7, 2003, www.massnews.com.

///

Law loses its way

By John F. Molloy
Mar. 27, 2005 12:00 AM

When I began practicing law in 1946, justice was much simpler. I joined a small Tucson practice at a salary of $250 a month, excellent compensation for a beginning lawyer. There was no paralegal staff or expensive artwork on the walls.

In those days, the judicial system was straightforward and efficient. Decisions were handed down by judges who applied the law as outlined by the Constitution and state legislatures. Cases went to trial in a month or two, not years. In the courtroom, the focus was on uncovering and determining truth and fact.

I charged clients by what I was able to accomplish for them. The clock did not start ticking the minute they walked through the door.

Looking back

The legal profession has evolved dramatically during my 87 years. I am a second generation lawyer from an Irish immigrant family that settled in Yuma. My father, who **passed the Bar with a fifth-grade education**, ended up arguing a case before the U.S. Supreme Court during his career.

The law changed dramatically during my years in the profession. For example, when I accepted my first appointment as a Pima County judge in 1957, I saw that lawyers expected me to act more as a referee than a judge. The county court I presided over resembled a gladiator arena, with dueling lawyers jockeying for points and one-upping each other with calculated and ingenuous briefs.

That was just the beginning.

By the time I ended my 50-year career as a trial attorney, judge and president of southern Arizona's largest law firm, I no longer had confidence in the legal fraternity I had participated in and, yes, profited from.

I was the ultimate insider, but as I looked back, I felt I had to write a book about serious issues in the legal profession and the implications for clients and society as a whole. ***The Fraternity: Lawyers and Judges in Collusion*** was 10 years in the making and has become my call to action for legal reform.

Disturbing evolution

Our Constitution intended that only elected lawmakers be permitted to create law.

Yet judges create their own law in the judicial system based on their own opinions and rulings. It's called case law, and it is churned out daily through the rulings of judges. When a judge hands down a ruling and that ruling survives appeal with the next tier of judges, it then becomes case law, or legal precedent. This now happens so consistently that we've become more subject to the case rulings of judges rather than to laws made by the lawmaking bodies outlined in our Constitution.

This case-law system is a constitutional nightmare because it continuously modifies Constitutional intent. **For lawyers, however, it creates endless business opportunities.** That's because case law is technically complicated and requires a lawyer's expertise to guide and move you through the system.

The judicial system may begin with enacted laws, but the variations that result from a judge's application of case law all too often change the ultimate meaning.

Lawyer domination

When a lawyer puts on a robe and takes the bench, he or she is called a judge. But in reality, when judges look down from the bench they are lawyers looking upon fellow members of their fraternity. In any other area of the free-enterprise system, this would be seen as a conflict of interest.

When a lawyer takes an oath as a judge, it merely enhances the ruling class of lawyers and judges. First of all, in Maricopa and Pima counties, judges are not elected but nominated by committees of lawyers, along with concerned citizens.

How can they be expected not to be beholden to those who elevated them to the bench? When they leave the bench, many return to large and successful law firms that leverage their names and relationships.

Business of law

The concept of "time" has been converted into enormous revenue for lawyers. The profession has adopted elaborate systems where clients are billed for a lawyer's time in six-minute increments. The paralegal profession is another brainchild of the fraternity, created as an additional tracking and revenue center. High-powered firms have departmentalized their services into separate profit centers for probate and trusts, trial, commercial, and so forth.

The once-honorable profession of law now fully functions as a bottom-line business, driven by greed and the pursuit of power and wealth, even shaping the laws of the United States outside the elected Congress and state legislatures.

Bureaucratic design

Today the skill and gamesmanship of lawyers, not the truth, often determine the outcome of a case. And we lawyers love it. All the tools are there to obscure and confound. The system's process of discovery and the exclusionary rule often work to keep vital information off-limits to jurors and make cases so convoluted and complex that only lawyers and judges understand them.

The net effect has been to increase our need for lawyers, create more work for them, clog the courts and ensure that most cases never go to trial and are, instead, plea-bargained and compromised. All the while the clock is ticking, and the monster is being fed.

The sullying of American law has resulted in a fountain of money for law professionals while the common people, who are increasingly affected by lawyer-driven changes and an expensive, self-serving bureaucracy, are left confused and ill-served.

Today, it is estimated that 70 percent of low-to-middle-income citizens can no longer afford the cost of justice in America. What would our Founding Fathers think?

This devolution of lawmaking by the judiciary has been subtle, taking place incrementally over decades. But today, it's engrained in our legal system, and few even question it. But the result is clear. Individuals can no longer participate in the legal system.

It has become too complex and too expensive, all the while feeding our dependency on lawyers.

By complicating the law, lawyers have achieved the ultimate job security. Gone are the days when American courts functioned to serve justice simply and swiftly.

It is estimated that **95 million legal actions** now pass through the courts annually, and the time and expense for a plaintiff or defendant in our legal system can be absolutely overwhelming.

Surely it's time to question what has happened to our justice system and to wonder if it is possible to return to a system that truly does protect us from wrongs.

http://www.azcentral.com/arizonarepublic/viewpoints/articles/0328molloy0327.html

(John F. Molloy was elected to the Arizona Court of Appeals, where he served as chief justice and authored more than 300 appellate opinions. Molloy wrote the final Miranda decision for the Arizona Supreme Court.)

Commentary on "Judge" Ancer L. Haggerty's Misapplication of So-called Absolute Judicial Immunity

The American People have had more than enough of judges committing heinous criminal acts then claiming the criminal act was a "judicial act" entitling them to absolute judicial immunity. Could any judge or magistrate rape a child in a court room while wearing a black robe, and then assert judicial immunity? There is no such Federal or State law that has a table of crimes citing which crime a judge can commit and which crimes are impermissible for a judge to commit even if wearing a black rode while in a courtroom. It is beyond question that judges cannot commit crimes of fraud and extortion then assert "judicial immunity". To commit or condone any crime in the presence of the court warrants the removal of such judge or magistrate from office for aiding and abetting felony acts.

Lawful Notice to the Court of Proper Handling of a F.R.Civ.P. Rule 60(b)(4) Motion

1. The Party challenging the jurisdiction of the court is invoking an administrative proceeding depriving the court of judicial discretion. 2. When jurisdiction is challenged, it is incumbent on the Party asserting that the court's jurisdiction was complete (and **not on the judge**) to show, on the Record wherein there were no jurisdictional failings. 3. Where the party asserting that the court had judicial power for the act has had notice and opportunity and has failed or refused to show, ***on the record,*** wherein there are no jurisdictional failings, the court has a **non-discretionary duty to vacate the court's void order or judgment.**

Hands off, "Judge" Haggerty! The law requires that you wait and see if the putative Plaintiff can prove that it is indeed in possession of the unaltered **original Promissory Note** signed by the live Third Party Intervener of Right **Corinna-Bridgett** [Family: Oleson]; and, even **more importantly** that the putative Plaintiff can prove that it was in possession of the aforesaid Note **prior** to its agents directing the "Successor Trustee" to initiate "nonjudicial" foreclosure proceedings against the private home and land lawfully owned by Salal Park, Inc. (a non-profit Oregon corporation) and, as the face of the Record already testifies by self-authenticating evidence, is held under a valid federal Land Patent.

Summary of Material Facts

Whereas this honorable court shall determine that alleged counsel for the putative Plaintiff cannot show, on the Record, that any fact witness for the putative Plaintiff rebutted the Affidavits of Truth filed into the Record by the live Third Party Intervener of Right Corinna-Bridgett, nor submitted undisputed Material Facts via sworn testimony and properly **authenticated** documents, this honorable court has a **non-discretionary fiduciary Duty to vacate** "Judge" Ancer L. Haggerty's void "ORDER TO REMAND" **and issue a pre-trial scheduling order.**

This commercial Instrument is signed in full harmony with F.R.Civ.P. "RULE 11".

Done and dated by my hand on this Tenth Day of the Ninth Month, in the Year of our Lord Yahushua, The Christ, Two-thousand-eight; and, of the Independence of these united States of America, the two hundred and thirty-second, under restricted signature, that is to say, with all One's constitutionally protected birthright Prerogatives, Immunities, and unalienable Rights reserved, and all Remedies preserved,

Corinna-Bridgett

Corinna-Bridgett, *in esse,*
Third Party Intervener of Right

Certificate of Service

(In regard to U.S. District Court Case Number CV08-0813-PK)

The Undersigned certifies, that on the Tenth day of September, Anno Domini 2008, she served a true, correct and complete copy of the foregoing: **Defendants' Motion to Vacate Void "ORDER TO REMAND"**; along with a true copy of this **Certificate of Service** upon the named Party Plaintiff shown below, by **USPS Certified Mail** (Return Receipt Requested) at the business address set forth below, a full true copy thereof with postage prepaid to the putative Plaintiff:

WASHINGTON MUTUAL BANK, N. A.
Attention: Kerry K. Killinger, Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer; or Successor
1201 Third Avenue [near: 98101]
Seattle (01), Washington
United States of America

Corinna-Bridgett